

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Alfred Gilchrist,)	CA No. 4:13-2648-MGL
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	OPINION AND ORDER
Lawson Battles, Nichols Mayor;)	
Chief Lewis, of the Nichols Police Department, and)	
Kim Hodge.)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff, a state prisoner in the South Carolina Department of Corrections, proceeding *pro se*, has filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that Defendants violated his constitutional rights. (ECF No. 1.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., all pre-trial proceedings were referred to a Magistrate Judge. On November 26, 2013, Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the Complaint in the above-captioned case be dismissed without prejudice. The Magistrate Judge provided Plaintiff a notice advising him of his right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 25 at 5.) On December 16, 2013, Plaintiff filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report. (ECF No. 27.).

The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The district court is obligated to conduct a *de novo* review of every portion of the Magistrate Judge's report to which objections have been filed. *Id.* The district

court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party makes only general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings and recommendations. *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47–48 (4th Cir.1982). The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

The court has carefully reviewed Plaintiff's objections and finds that his objections are non-specific and unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report. Plaintiff fails to specifically argue where the Magistrate Judge erred in his analysis. A party's general non-specific objection is insufficient to challenge findings by a Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, this Court need not explain its reasons for adopting the recommendation.

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court finds Plaintiff's objections are without merit. Accordingly, the court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. It is therefore ORDERED that the Complaint in the above-captioned case is DISMISSED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Mary G. Lewis
United States District Judge

Spartanburg, South Carolina
April 28, 2014